

**NOTES  
OF THE MONDAY, MARCH 15, 2010 MEETING**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE**

**Meeting held at:**

Balboa Park Club  
Santa Fe Room  
San Diego, CA 92101

**Mailing address is:**

Balboa Park Administration  
2125 Park Boulevard MS39  
San Diego, CA 92101-4792

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members Present**

Vicki Granowitz,	Aurelia Flores
Chair of BPTF	Chuck Hellerich
Robert (Bob) Ames, Vice	Dale Hess
Chair	Dea Hurston
Ron Buckley	John Lomac
Laurie Burgett	Paul Meyer
Left at 7:34	Gonzalo Rojas
Carol Chang	Dalouge Smith
Bruce Coons	Arrived 6:42
Berit Durler	Judy Swink
Ray Ellis	

**Members Absent**

None

**Staff Present**

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES OF FEBRUARY BPTF MEETING**

No corrections. Judy moved for acceptance, Carol seconded, unanimously accepted.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** – None

**CHAIRPERSON’S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

- This will not be the final meeting; we need to calendar the report for “adoption” in April. We have not briefed the Mayor or Todd; waiting for other actions by elected officials, try to get media coverage for last meeting. Hopefully, the last meeting will be short.
- Need to start doing briefings for city council members, some know, some new, need to educate. If TF members have personal relationships with council members, it would be good.
- Gonzalo – will there be an official presentation (? PowerPoint) for the briefings? Vdg will work on something, good idea. Talking points, not PowerPoint.

**WORKSHOP**

**1. Draft Final Report**

**a. Format**

**b. Executive Summary**

Page 1, item 5: There was discussion about whether or not to include “governance” as a goal towards which to work, among the others listed. [NOTE – The note keeper had a small problem with her laptop during the early part of this discussion and lost some specific comments from TF members. However, comments included reference to the language in the task/title set for this TF (as support for inclusion of the term), and concerns about limiting the activities of the Entity.]

- About 5 minutes of discussion that was not saved.
- Gonzalo – it should be included to be complete, for the future.
- Ron – initially “sounding board” for changes to operations of the park, not necessarily taking on making the changes.
- Paul – the TF has gone to pains to emphasize that discretionary decisions remain with the City. My concern is that if we use the term “governance” that it will need a lengthy discussion of the meaning of the term and how a private entity takes on “governance” issues. To make clear that these powers remain with the city, we should shy away from naming it.
- Laurie – maybe with a different word? “Leadership”?

- Vicki – the initial focus is fundraising. “Governance” means different things to different people.
- Berit – if we are not addressing “governance”, then the title of the report should change.
- Bruce – “may or may not include”, as Judy suggested.
- Carol – yes, add the indefinite “may” and add other activities also.
- Dea – don’t limit the Entity to “modest goals”. The Initial board will be people who can get things done and can raise money. The Entity should be part of LARGE goals.
- Judy – open with a clear statement that “the entity will begin with fundraising AND (instead of “but”) work toward a broad range of park activities which may include ...”.
- Vicki – add “governance”? NO
- Bob – the word is a minefield. Use a less emphatic term – “coordinating”?
- Judy gave the wording to Vicki.

**c. Background**

- John – remove question mark at end of 1.b.
- Ray – email typos to vdg, let’s look at content here.
- John – Page 4 II.B.3. “responsibly managed” – this is going to the city – this is derogatory – we should remove this.
- Vdg – should we change it? YES, by consensus
- Ron – II.B. General conclusions – language re “would” or “should”.
- Aurelia – Page 4 II.B.4. – re money – allude to ability to spend it on projects.
- Chuck – the vision is that the MOU will address issue – can change with time and circumstances – part of job for NE is to make sure it has power to raise funds for project via MOU. Donors must know the Entity has authority to do projects.
- Vdg – “process is onerous” – can’t start project without going through the process.
- Bruce – levels of approval, some normal, some strange – DSD, Historic Resources, then Parks, then offered to city, then unions have to decline before you can go outside city.
- Judy – we don’t need to address that level of detail.
- Aurelia – “pre-approved plan of action according to MOU” – refer back to MOU – sense of relationship being built – differently than before.
- John – phrasing: subject to agreed-upon MOU?
- Chuck – plan of action ...
- Vdg – this level of detail is not necessary. It is clear that there will be an MOU.
- Laurie – clarification – since politics and players change.
- Vdg – process/Dev Services – not much change, pretty stable.
- Chuck – plan of action will be thru the MOU.
- Carol – see B.1.g.
- Judy – in B.4. “This means the city would retain...”. There are several places that mention that land use decisions remain with the city. Can we delete that sentence?
- Vdg – disagree – people will look for a statement that the city will retain control – policy document, not legal document.
- Ron –B.5. “plan updates”?
- Laurie – master plan – someone needs to update the long-term vision.
- Vdg – 1st sentence is important part.
- Chuck – liked that the group be part of it.
- Ron – this should concentrate on fundraising.
- Judy – future options.
- Vdg – okay as currently written? YES (everyone except Ron and John)
- Bruce – some words are not good ones – will email vdg.

**d. New Entity Creation, Structure and Start-Up**

- Judy – several points are in both sections – will work with vdg.
- Pg 7?
- Bruce – add that Initial Board should have someone with historic preservation experience, specifically with Secretary of Interior standards.
- Vdg – added tourism industry
- Arts & culture? ok
- Board size – no changes
- Committees – Executive Committee is definite, others are “suggested”
- Bob – page 8, 4.iii.7. strategic planning as part of Governance Committee? Executive Committee usually reserves strategic planning – suggest moving it up to EC section.

- Judy agrees.
- Vdg – moving it to 3b.
- Anything else re committees? No.

**e. Relationships**

- John – IV.A.4.a. should be “office of Mayor” not “the Mayor”.
- John, IV.A.5. – “gain trust of public” – weasel language
- All for out, except Paul.
- John – IV.A.6. “with time and experience would act as point of contact” – should be immediately – delete “time and experience”.
- Vdg – balance competence, confidence.
- Judy – these sentences will not be reassuring to those who are already distrustful.
- Chuck – leave it in.
- Judy – “would become” instead of “with time and experience would act as”?
- John – delete “time and experience”.
- Carol – language issue
- Judy “the NE would act as a consistent point of contact”
- Ron – “representing the general public” – public probably won’t think this group will represent them.
- Judy – “a” consistent point of contact vs. “the” point of contact.
- Gonzalo – “will evolve”.
- Berit – call for straw vote.
- John’s suggestion – eliminate “with time and experience” – majority agreed.
- Chuck – change words? “NE may evolve into the consistent point of contact”.
- Vote – majority agreed.
- Bruce – vs. general public – “interests of general public” – ok.
- Judy – Internal “Relations” vs. “Relationships”.
- Vicki – Section E – re-written with assistance from Ray – Transparency Requirements.
- Judy – more clear and sequential.
- Vdg – clarify confidential vs. public info.
- Dalouge – Item 2.
- Vdg – this will change
- Bob – Item 3 – “certain areas of particular importance to public” – see next page.

**f. Foundational Information Recommendations**

- Bob – add item F – Lease info on existing tenancies in park – so they can avoid bumping into contractual arrangements with city.
- Judy – these are public.
- Chuck – this section looks like it needs filling in – need more info on each item? Brief description?
- Laurie – get info from other docs?
- Chuck – put A thru F in single line?
- Judy likes list.
- Bruce – flesh out a little.
- Dalouge – simple description would be helpful.
- Vdg – send me the suggestions.

**g. Review of City of San Diego Foundation Documents**

- Chuck – “foundation documents” – what does that mean?
- Substitute “regulatory” for “foundation”? Agreed
- No comments

**h. Bibliography – needs work**

**i. MOU**

- Bob – item 11 – city will notify NE on use permits,
- Paul – policy question – item 4 “current level of funding” – if we suggest to city that the park funding never drop below current level – if we ask for that, we should discuss it more fully and make it more clear what that level is.
- Ron – this is “ideal”
- Bob - #4 was troubling to me for other reasons – when city thinks in terms of its maintenance obligations in the park – it thinks of its contractual obligations with individual lessees. Include in discussion funding supplied to tenants under lease obligations. Ambivalent re how much city provides for general infrastructure (vs. maintenance).

- Gonzalo – this is to make sure that funds raised by NE will not supplant funds provided by city already.
- Judy – discussed at length in subcommittee.
- Bob – clarify “maintenance”,
- Judy – will not reduce current level of funding for park,
- Bruce – what does this mean? Percentage of budget, x number of dollars?
- Vdg – says city must continue to take care of the park at current level of funding,
- Carol – we need words that say “don’t use this fundraising to forgive city obligation”.
- Dalouge – mention in body as well as in MOU? – add to key findings/general conclusions – agreed
- Ron – #6 “single pt of contact” – sounds good but experience is that there is a process, not just one person.
- Vdg – Dev Services has a project manager.
- Ron – Project Managers (PMs) have no approval authority – just point of contact – #6 says approval.
- Vdg – point of contact can tell status of approval.
- Dalouge – Stacey was asked if P&R has resources to assign a Point of Contact – no money .
- Vdg – real entitlement process resides in other departments, but there is no standard process.
- Dalouge – are we asking for a navigator? Yes.
- Ron – is that redundant if P&R is ex officio on board?
- Vdg – need process to be clear.
- #7 –
- Judy – jumps right into project management, which *may* occur down the line.
- Ray – donors want to see that.
- Ray – communicate that these are deal points.
- John – Can we ask city to fund Organizing Committee because it has to come up with funds for an attorney – where else will it come from?
- Vdg – City doesn’t have money, our only staff here is vdg and note taker.
- Chuck – don’t rule out getting funding.
- Vdg – good to ask, but don’t count on it, there is no money
- Chuck – if we are forming a private entity to raise money, we should be able to raise money for what we’re doing.
- Ray – don’t want strings attached to money – got to go private
- Judy – one task of Organizing Committee is to seek funding
- Bob – there are sources of seed money.

## 2. Next Steps

- a. Send vdg your edits and changes.
- b. David Kinney – as representative of BPCP, he commends the TF for the work done – a well-crafted report.
- c. David Kinney – Comment on “governance” – this will be an important role – there is a lack of real governance in park – the NE needs to be involved, whether or not the word is included in document.
- d. Judy – NE will need to feel its way towards this.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

## **Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:**

6:00 P.M. on Monday, April 19, 2010  
 Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room  
 San Diego, CA 92101

For more information please contact:

Vicki Granowitz, Chair of the Balboa Park Task Force at (619) 584-1203.